



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER 672532-102	FILING DATE 8/4/203285	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ZAMIEROWSKI	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 89003
-----------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------

LITMAN, MC MAHON AND BROWN
1500 ONE KANSAS CITY PLACE
1200 MAIN STREET
KANSAS CITY, MO 64105

EXAMINER
DALEY, R

ART. OF
336

01/17/90

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-78 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☒ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial No. 332699

-2-

Art Unit 336

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Groves.

Groves discloses a wound dressing comprising wound covering means (20) with an intermediate layer (5), adhesive releaseably attaching means (6), an opening (7) communicating with the skin, and a tube (8) communicating with the skin. Groves also has means for withdrawing fluid from the sight (see col. 3, line 34).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 11, 14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller.

Miller discloses a wound dressing comprising a wound cover (c) with an intermediate layer (b), and opening (f) and a tube (e). Miller discloses a suction port so it inherently possess a means for closing the tube.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

Serial No. 332699

-3-

Art Unit 336

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.


Claims 8, 10, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Groves in view of Errede et al.

Applicant differ from Groves by providing or the intermediate layers made of a hydrocolloid and a fibrin. Errede discloses a wound dressing which uses a hydrocolloid and a fibrin. It would have been obvious to make Groves dressing out of a hydrocolloid and a fibrin in view of Errede which teaches it is well known to do so.

In regard to claim 13 it is unclear whether the needle vent on Groves is resealable or not. Either way, it is well known to use resealable openings on medical tubes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to K. Daley at telephone number (703) 557-3125.


kad
January 17, 1990


C. FRED ROSENBAUM
S. P. E.
ART UNIT 336